

accord, though nobly enforced by the early Christians, has not passed into the popular sentiment of Christendom." ¹ Passing by the assertion that the early Christians enforced any such rule, which may well be questioned, we ask : Why are these views not in the mores ? Undoubtedly it is because they are dogmatic in form, invented and imposed by theological authority ² or philosophical speculation. They do not grow out of the experience of life and cannot be verified by it. Woman bears an unequal share of the responsibilities and duties of sex and reproduction just as certainly and justly as man bears an unequal share of the responsibilities and duties of property, war, and politics. The reasons are in ultimate physiological facts by virtue of which one is a woman and the other is a man.

374. Love marriage. Conjugal affection. "Wife." It must be assumed that even in the lowest form of society a man may have preferred one woman to others, but love between a man and a woman is not a phenomenon of uncivilized society. It begins with wealth and luxury. Love stories can be found in very early folklore, legends, and poetry, but they belong to idealization, to romance and unreality. Realistic love stories are now hardly a century old. It is evident that they lead to idealization. They put cases and solve them, and every reader forms a judgment whether the case has actuality and whether the solution is correct. Love in half-civilization and in antiquity was erotic only. The Greeks conceived of it as a madness by which a person was afflicted through the caprice or malevolence of some god or goddess. Such a passion is necessarily evanescent. The ancient peoples in general, and the Semites in particular, did not think this pas-

sion an honorable or trustworthy basis of marriage.
 The Kaffirs
 think that a Christian wife, married for love, is
 shameful. They
 compare her to a cat, the only animal which,
 amongst them, has
 no value, but is obtained as a gift.³ The
gandharva marriage
 of the Hindoos was a love marriage, and was not
 honorable.
 It was free love and became, in practice, an
 entirely informal
 union without institutional guarantees.⁴ This
 would be, at best,

1
³ *Globus*, LXXV, 271.
² *Ibid.*, 135.
 159.

Lecky, *Eur. Morals*, II, 347.
⁴ Wilkins, *Modern Hinduism*,
 159.